

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 2, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Baissus.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Baissus.

Claims 3-8 are considered as containing allowable subject matter.

Claim 7 has been amended to avoid the Examiner's objection thereto.

Claim 11 has been also herein amended.

Referring now to Baissus et al this patent teaches a method and a device for recovering synchronization of a signal transmitted to a mobile-telephone receiver (mobile station). Baissus et al. discloses the course estimation step B and a second and third fine estimation steps C and D (column 9, lines 4-22).

Regarding claims 1 and 9 the Examiner equates the course estimation with the first synchronized word detecting window and a fine estimation with applicant's second synchronized word detecting window.

However, according to claim 1 of the present application the second synchronized word detecting window covers the position of the synchronized word and is within the same time period as the first synchronized word detecting window. This substantially differs from Baissus et al. which disclosed the course estimation over 6 symbols and the fine estimation over 8 symbols.

Baissus et al. fails to show or suggest the device and method in which the second synchronized word detecting window covers the position of the synchronized word within the first synchronized word detecting window and is within the same time period as the first synchronized word detecting window.

In addition, there is no description or suggestion in Baissus et al. regarding resetting of the position of the second synchronized word detecting window as related to the first synchronized word detecting window under a predetermined condition.

Regarding claim 11 the Examiner states that Baissus et al teach that the second synchronized word window is narrower than the first. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement.

Baissus et al. (column 9, lines 8-14) discloses "use is made of the coarse estimator over six symbols". However, in column 9, lines 15 and 18 Baissus describes that a fine estimate is over 8 symbols and the coarse estimate is over 6 symbols.

Claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over Baissus et al. for the same reasons as were applied above to claims 1 and 9.

In view of the remarks set forth above this application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully solicited. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further action.

Any fee due with this paper, not fully covered by an enclosed check, may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

Samson Helfgott
Reg. No. 23,072

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
575 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022-2585
(212) 940-8800
(212) 940-8986